WILSHIRE'S

"LET THE NATION OWN THE TRUSTS"

GAYLORD WILSHIRE
-Editor-

Vol. XV. No. 9 NEW YORK, SEPTEMBER, 1911 Price, 5 Cents per Copy

The London Dock Strike and Syndicalism Is It The Future Power?

THERE can be no denying the fact that there are many old-time European Socialists who are losing their faith in parliamentary action and are now looking for results from the direct action of labor united in all-embracing industrial unions as opposed to the present system of unions in crafts.

In America there is not so much of this feeling, probably because the Socialists have only now begun to obtain political successes, and it is too early for them to be disappointed at results. However, it is already known and admitted that local successes of the Socialist Party, while desirable, yet can do very little toward solving the social problem. The only thing that can completely solve the problem is the establishment of the National Co-operative Commonwealth, and to do this manifestly requires a national political success of a very dominating character.

However, in Europe there is no doubt but that the workers were led to believe that the election of a mayor meant something akin to the introduction of the millennium, and they are now awaking to the fact that one mayor don't make an earthly paradise any more than one swallow a spring.

The getting of control of the world's national parliaments by Socialists is hedged around with many difficulties. It will be next to impossible for the Socialists in Germany ever to gain political control of Germany if they are to rely entirely upon constitutional and legal methods.

One reason is that the property qualification would always keep them out of control of the Upper House, and then we must remember that the Kaiser doesn't put himself up annually for popular re-election.

However, it recognized that labor always has the power of making society come to its knees by merely going on a strike and threatening the Nation with general starvation if its terms are not complied with. But it's one thing to have the power and it's quite another to have brains to use it. An ox has the power to resist the yoke, but he hasn't the brain, so he works for a master.

In the early days when the industrial machine was not so complex and all-embracing as at present, labor had little or no chance to gain very much by union. In the first place, there was no great product being turned out before the days of the great industrial organizations of to-day, therefore there was no great surplus remaining in the hands of the landlords and capitalists for labor to get.

In the next place, the difficulties both of effective organization as well as of effective action thereafter were enormous compared with to-day.

When men were employed in small isolated shops in small groups it was manifestly less easy to organize them than it is to-day when they are employed in enormous establishments usually near together.

And then it is so much easier to stop the movement of a chronometer than of a glacier.

One screw loose, one small wheel out of adjustment and the watch stops. A baby can stop a watch. Modern industrial society is as delicately adjusted as a watch. Let the men supplying coal, strike for long enough a period and the whole machine stops. Let a few men refuse to work on the city water supply and let there be no other offer to supply their places, and again society is on its knees. In the primitive days the stoppage of one section of the workers had purely a limited local effect. It would be easy to run over the many ways in which the stoppage of work of an infinitesimal part of the workers would cause the breakdown of the whole industrial fabric.

With the growing knowledge of this power resting in the hands of the workers of to-day and the knowledge that the exercise of it may bring forth such advantageous and immediate results that it is but natural that a few successful attempts, like the London Dock Strike, at "industrialism" will cause a deflection of the attack upon the present system from the political field to the industrial field.

Perhaps deflection is not the word, for it is well known that we never have such success in the political field as has come as the result of a strike, successful or otherwise.

The great London Dock strike of last month is a most telling illustration of what can be accomplished by concerted action between men united from different trades. The dockers were granted all they had demanded; ordinarily this would have meant they would have yelled "victory" and returned to their work. But this time they did not. Not they. But they refused to return until the carters had their grievances also adjusted. And so one trade supported the other, all refusing to go back until all were granted what they asked.

London was in a state of siege, the taxi-cabs and the motor busses were about to stop for want of gas-

oline. Provisions were rising to unheard-of prices. Parliament met and voted to consider what could be done to prevent the threatened famine. It was at last recognized that the great dock strike had far more in it that was vital to the Nation than the sham fight then going on in the House of Lords for the perpetuation of feudalism.

In the London strike the men were not betrayed, as were our coal miners by Roosevelt and John Mitchell in our big coal strike a few years back.

In our coal strike the strikers could have frozen us if we had not brought it to an end; in the London dock strike the strikers could have starved us.

One great advantage of direct action is the immediate character of the result; wages are raised and conditions improved at once if the strike is successful. Whereas in the case of a success at the polls it may be years before any result is attained.

Berger is elected Congressman and the Socialists carry Milwaukee, good as far as it goes, great, in fact. But no one can say that if there had been a successful industrial strike in Milwaukee that the immediate results as to wages and conditions would not have been greater than from the political victory.

On the other hand, it is much harder to achieve an industrial victory, in fact, I will admit that I myself, while adhering to the method in principle, looked upon it as almost impractical of operation. And I am not at all sure right now, even with the results of the London Dock Strike before me, that Industrial Action is within sight in the United States.

All I can say is that given sufficient intelligence among the workers that the Industrial Action is a far more potent weapon than is Political Action. It requires much less percentage of the workers to make it effective and its results cannot be set aside by any appeal to a medieval constitution.

However, the logical method for the workers is to pursue both the political and the industrial warfare, using the particular weapon which for the time being seems most deadly; in fact, there is no reason why they should not go into the fight doubly armed, using both weapons all the time.

The supineness of the Labor Members of Parliament is undoubtedly the cause of this swing in England toward Syndicalism. It will not be denied that the Labor Party as a weapon for Socialism has been largely a failure.

This may be the fault of the men who were sent there or it may be on account of the defect of the parliamentary system itself; it is probably a little of both. The men as a whole are certainly not effective, they have neither a good knowledge of Socialism nor have they the courage of what convictions they may possess. On the other hand it is doubtful, even if the labor members were all that we might hope for, that results would have been materially different.

The particular hero of Industrialism in England is Tom Mann, that old veteran of the dock strike of 1889, who is now back home again after having agitated a number of years in Australia. Fortunately, he is still in his physical and intellectual prime. The particular system of fighting the battle of labor by Industrial Unionism has been a fetish with him all his life.

Mann and Odon Por are about to publish jointly a book upon the philosophy of Industrialism, otherwise Syndicalism. It will be worth reading.

That the revolutionary character of the trend of Trade-Unionism to Syndicalism is recognized by the Capitalist Class is seen from the following taken on the morning of August 12th, when victory was apparent, from the London *Daily Graphic:*

THE MORAL OF THE STRIKE.

The public will learn with the greatest relief this morning that the strike is settled. The men's leaders congratulate their followers on their success; and the main fact which will impress the mind of the public is the way in which the strikers have persisted in defying the law of the land. Probably their leaders claim that the success which the strike has achieved has been partly due to the violence employed, and regard this as a sufficient justification for the course pursued. They probably argue that men who believe themselves to be underpaid and overworked are justified in using violence if it will lead to an improvement in their conditions of life. This is evidently the doctrine held by French Socialists, and there is some reason to fear that it is growing popular in England. It is hardly necessary to point out that such a doctrine leads to absolute anarchy. If a man may overturn a cart or knock down a policeman to improve his own economic position, he may by the same line of reasoning commit murder or arson for the same purpose. French Socialists do not shrink from this conclusion, and the strikers on the State railways have not hesitated to damage signals and cut telegraph wires, well knowing that such action might result in the wholesale destruction of human life. So far as motive is concerned, there is little to choose between such action and that of the strikers in London and Liverpool, who are evidently depriving the poorest people of their food supplies. The whole business is extremely disquieting. It points to a spirit of common morality which is fraught with the greatest danger for the future.

It is absurd to think that any great progress can be made by labor in either the industrial field or the political field by conforming to strictly "legal" methods.

The rules of the game were especially drawn up to prevent successful attack on property rights, and when it is so much easier to break a rule than it is to change it, can anyone wonder that labor follows the line of least resistance?

It also must be remembered that labor had nothing to do with the making of the laws which shackle it.

There is many a law to-day on our statute books that represents an old law first broken then changed.

The Los Angeles Case: Dynamite or Gas?

SOCIALISTS, in the eagerness to defend everyone connected with the labor movement from every possible charge, should not lose their heads in their zeal.

We may say with confidence that the men charged with blowing up the Los Angeles *Times* Building were men devoting their lives to the cause of labor. However, that declaration does not carry with it the conclusion that it would be impossible under any circumstances for them to have used force to bring around a recalcitrant employer, especially when we consider the merry old scoundrel they were fighting.

Force has certainly been used at other times by labor in its fights with Capital, and used successfully, too, for that matter. There is no doubt but that the fear of injury to property by strikers, either direct or indirect, has won many a strike. If a strike did not injure an employer why should he ever give in?

Is it not illogical that, occasionally, some men seeking to force an

employer to accede to terms should threaten him with injury? Certainly not, and the only reason why they would not carry the threat into execution would be fear of greater injury to the cause.

The Los Angeles strikers are only human, and we must not set them upon a pedestal, taking the position that it is absurd and impossible to conceive of their having had anything to do with injuring the *Times* Building. May be they did, more probably they did not.

On the other hand, we know that Otis and his gang would stoop to anything in order to inculpate them, guilty or not guilty. We even think that it is not an impossible suggestion that Otis had his own building blown up. He would if he thought that would have helped him win. We also know that there is quite a doubt as to whether the building was not accidentally blown up by gas instead of dynamite, and that no one was to blame for the explosion.

Finally we know that the men under indictment were illegally kidnapped and taken to California, and that procedure in itself is strong presumptive evidence that the prosecution had no evidence to justify extradition.

The August number of *McClure's* has an article on the subject written by Harvey J. O'Higgins that is certainly very convincing that McNamara was more or less conversant with the pursuit of dynamiting, if we accept the abstract facts as given. But we don't accept the "facts." We know that "facts" are not so very difficult of manufacture when the Capitalist wishes to get Labor on the hip, and they are naturally *convincing* facts, otherwise they would be of no value.

However, a reading of the article indicates that the trial is going to be no picnic for the defense. Whether the evidence is manufactured or otherwise, it is certainly going to be strong evidence with a jury.

We must remember that in the Haywood-Moyer case the prosecution relied upon the testimony of one man only, Orchard. The story hung together pretty well upon cross-examination, its great weakness being the lack of corroboration.

Clarence Darrow really based his defense in his speech to the jury far more upon the plea that the men if guilty had great justification than he did upon the theory of the impossibility of their guilt.

Now in the McNamara case we must look for a far stronger case than was presented against Haywood. We must remember, too, that, if McManigle has really confessed, he is a man who will carry far more weight than that poor degenerate Harry Orchard.

The defendants have a hard case to win, and those that sympathize with the aspirations of labor would do well to put their shoulders to the wheel in their aid and Do it Now.

If guilty they have risked their necks for the sake of the cause of labor, risked them in a foolish reprehensible way, we may say, but nevertheless, they were fighting the fight. We may sympathize with their aim and at the same time denounce their methods—provided they are guilty, which we do not believe—as brutal and cowardly and as being far more apt to injure than aid their cause.

If they are innocent, and in the light of the facts so far brought forward we think they are innocent, then we say that their kidnapping and indictment upon manufactured evidence goes far to show how perilous is the path of those who dare to stand against the rule of the American Dollar.

But innocent or guilty, we consider that the industrial conditions in America which make the possibility of such a crime as being in the least plausible is a damning indictment of the Capitalist System.

It is to be remembered that the defendants are not members of the Socialist Party, nor are they Socialists. If they were it would be quite impossible for Socialists to conceive of their guilt. Not because they would be better men, but because the whole philosophy of Socialism is opposed to the use of force by individuals against individuals to redress social evils.

We know that the only remedy of a social wrong is social action. The Los Angeles *Times* is a typical representative of the present Social System, and that the true method of attacking it effectively is by the ballot.

Let California vote for Socialism; let her establish shorter hours and a minimum wage for printers as for all wage-earners, and there would be no reason for the craziest worker to think of coercing employers by dynamite.

If the men are guilty then all the more reason for California preventing further outrages by voting for Socialism.

If the men are not guilty, then in order to prevent a condition which might lead men to crime and dynamite in order to get a living wage California should vote for Socialism.

Meanwhile, it is up to all true friends of labor to stand shoulder to shoulder and see that the accused have an absolutely fair trial. Let there be No Repetition of the Haymarket.

Killing the Scarecrow

(From *Hampton's Magazine.*)

WISCONSIN has La Follette—or, if you prefer to put it that way, La Follette, politically speaking, has Wisconsin. What this progressive spirit would do to the State has been freely predicted by some of Wisconsin's most eminent citizens. In 1903, for example, a large number of leading business men joined in protesting to the legislature against La Follette's railroad commission bill. They felt that it would jeopardize the agricultural and manufacturing interests whence the State derives its wealth and greatness. "If those who are in charge of the business interests of the State are satisfied with the present rates of transportation," they cogently argued, "it would seem that those who manage the politics of the State ought to be satisfied and not attempt to interfere in our business affairs." During the next year leading business men renewed the warning in even more solemn terms. The railroad commission law was enacted, however, and put into effect.

In the five years after that calamitous event revenues of railroads in Wisconsin increased from fifty million dollars to sixty-five million dollars. The Census Bureau reported the other day that in five years the value of products manufactured in Milwaukee had increased fifty-one per cent., the amount of salaries and wages paid in the manufactories had increased fifty-three per cent. and the average number of wage-earners employed had increased thirty-seven per cent. Though Wisconsin is not one of the chief grain States, the value of her farm crops increased fifty-three per cent. in the last census period.

Such are the dire results of progressive legislation in Wisconsin. It is a disheartening fact, indeed—applicable to the entire country—that no sooner do leading citizens get some fine bogy-man propped up on his lath-pins than out comes a census bulletin and bowls him over.

Japan spends $3,650,000 annually in newspaper advertising, a sum which is constantly increasing every year.

Established 1900
WILSHIRE'S MAGAZINE
Published Monthly by
Wilshire Publishing Co.
115 Nassau Street.
New York City
GAYLORD WILSHIRE
Editor

Subscription 50 Cents per Year. Club of Eight 25c. per Year.

Wilshire Publishing Co. Incorporated under the Laws of the State of New York.

GAYLORD WILSHIRE.....President
S. M. WALLING.....Vice-President
WM. H. LEFFINGWELL.....Sec'y and Treas.
JOSHUA WANHOPE.....Managing Editor

Entered at the New York Post Office as second class matter.

Vol. XV SEPTEMBER, 1911 No. 9

Taft; A Good Dating Machine

SOME of the readers of this magazine may remember, before the election I think it was, I wrote an editorial rather commendatory of Taft. I had several "traitor" letters shot at me by some of my warmer readers as a consequence.

And now I must admit that their warmer instinct was better than my cold reason. Taft has certainly made a bad fall down since he first squashed into the Presidential chair.

When he was judge he at least seemed to play the Capitalist game fairly enough even though he was always ready enough to sit on labor.

But now that he is President he not only betrays unfairness and littleness in his treatment of Socialists, but to others as well.

His letter about the Warren pardon was the limit of pettyfoggery, it not only exhibited a narrow, mean mind, but it showed him stupid enough not to conceal his meanness.

His attempt to "get even" with the Magazine publishers by suddenly trying to push through a postal bill increasing their rate of postage was only characteristic of his latest trick to favor "Brother Charley" and the Guggenheims by secretly throwing open a terminal railway site in Alaska on Controller Bay in order to allow their agent Ryan to locate it before the public knew about its being open.

It's another case somewhat like his ante-dating act in the Ballinger case which La Follette, Brandeis, and others have charged him with and to which he has not replied.

However, in order that I may not be accused of making charges against Taft stronger than the case warrants, I will quote from the *Outlook*, of which his old friend Roosevelt is the editor:

The control over these railways and over their terminals by the Secretary of the Interior and by the Interstate Commerce Commission was safeguarded so long as the land remained in the possession of the Federal government. Suddenly, without public warning, but with apparently the knowledge of certain interested parties, over twelve thousand acres of land bordering on that part of the bay nearest to the ship channel were eliminated from the National Forest and thrown open to private entry. This elimination of the one remaining unmonopolized outlet for the Cunningham coal region was done, not by public proclamation with due notice, but by an Executive order. This occurred last fall, on October 28. Ordinarily such an order is issued with a sixty days' notice, and when it was originally prepared this order contained such a notice; but between the time of its preparation and the time of its issue the sixty days' notice was eliminated. Within four days surveys had been made at this point, which is far beyond the reach of the telegraph, and a claim in accordance with this Executive order had been filed. In other words, the Executive order and the filing of the claim were virtually simultaneous. Within two weeks two other claims had been filed, together with the rights of way of the projected railway. There is now a long stretch of water front, at least a mile long, that, with the possible exception of one section of eighty rods, is likely, if not certain, to fall into private possession.

Of course, Teddy's word on anything is not final by any means, and Teddy himself has things to explain in his own record, for instance, how he happened when Governor of New York to give favors to gas companies after declaring—before election—that he never, never would. Nevertheless, his editorial, considering the source, has a significance. We wonder what Teddy will do next election, Taft is sure to be the Republican nominee.

It's curious that the Republican Party should have had the hard luck to have such a millstone as Taft hung around its neck when we consider that it was the grafters who fought Taft hardest in the convention.

It's also funny how Taft always does these foolish and dishonorable things, and then makes the evidence so clear that he cannot be shielded by even his best friends. In this Controller Bay case the incriminating letters were actually in the government files and would still be there had they not been spirited away. Wm. Marion Reedy says in his *Mirror* very pertinently:

It does not seem possible that fatuity could go so far as the filing of the Dick Ryan letter to Dick Ballinger about the Controller Bay claim and Charlie Taft's interest in that scheme to capture the port of entry and outlet near the coal lands of Aaska. And yet the woman who says she saw the letter in the Interior Department files is believed by all the people who know her. Miss Abbott showed her article, containing a copy of the letter, to Ballinger's successor, Mr. Fisher. Mr. Fisher induced Collier's not to publish it. Then the letter disappeared—like the raised voucher for Justice Day's portrait. The facts now come out that Dick Ryan filed his claim two days after the President's order opening the place to entry, while to all the rest of the country the Presidential order was a secret one, not made public until six months later. Isn't it funny how Taft is always caught dating things back or ahead or indulging in some other form of skullduggery or at least conniving at such things? He's an unwieldy duffer, is Mr. Taft; not fit at all to travel with a fellow like Dick Ballinger.

It's not the policy of WILSHIRE'S to go into the delinquencies of individuals, but nevertheless, when a man is elected as President by a party professing to be imbued with a "Great Moral Idea," it's too much of a temptation not to exhibit their inconsistency, especially when they are admittedly going to re-nominate him for a second term.

Interest In The Berger Speech

(Editorial in the *Daily Oklahoman*, July 30.)

WHILE it has been more than a month since Victor L. Berger, Socialist member from Wisconsin, addressed the Lower House while the wool schedule was under discussion, there is still a constant demand from all quarters for his speech in pamphlet form, and the requests to members of the delegation from this State indicate that there is considerable interest in Oklahoma in the "only Socialist address ever delivered in the halls of Congress." Representative Davenport, of the Third district, has alone mailed out more than twenty-five of the pamphlets in response to requests.

The address, and the discussion which immediately followed it, are worth reading. The questions put to the speaker by other members,

and the further fact that many of the other members present gathered around him and listened intently to his utterances, indicated the intense interest in what this representative Socialist had to say. They were anxious to hear arguments coming from another angle; views which they knew to be sincere whether they might indorse them or reject them.

He told them frankly: "There is no such thing as protection to labor in any tariff bill. You are not in the habit of making laws for the protection of labor. You are continually making laws for the protection of life and property—for the protection of the lives of those who own the property, and for the protection of the property they own. You are continually making laws for manufacturers, bankers and merchants. But the workingman who has no other property than his labor gets scant protection indeed." He asserted that there was always free trade in labor, continuing:

Under the present system, which we call in political economy the capitalist system, the workingman's labor has become a mere ware in the market. And since the man's labor cannot be separated from the man, the workingman himself has become a commodity, whose time is bought and sold. The workingman, or rather his labor power, is subject to the same conditions as every other ware, especially to the conditions of supply and demand and to competition.

The workingman's labor, or rather his time, is bought now in the open market by the highest bidder on the one hand from the lowest seller on the other.

And the employers, that is, the master class, care only to buy the workingman's time when he is young, strong and healthy. When he is sick or when he gets old the employer has no use for him.

The employer is not in business for the sake of charity. He is in business in order to make profits—to make money.

And because of this we see that our so-called free workers are sometimes worse off—from the purely economical point of view—than the blacks were under slavery before the war.

The negro was property and represented about $1,000 in value—sometimes less. He was property which his master owned. Therefore the master, if he had any sense, took good care of his human chattel. The master was eager to have the slave as long and in as good condition as possible. When the slave became sick or when he died the master lost money.

The case is entirely different with the white workingman, the so-called free workingman. When the white man is sick or when he dies the employer usually loses nothing.

And high tariff, or tariff for revenue only, or free trade, like "the flowers that bloom in the spring, have nothing to do with the case."

The fact is that the capitalist, the average employer to-day, is more concerned about a valuable horse, about a fine dog, about a good automobile, than he is about his employee or about his employee's family.

In most cases the employment is absolutely impersonal. The employer does not know his employee by name, or even by number. This is invariably the case with a stock company, where the shareholders are scattered all over a city, a State, or all over the country; sometimes over Europe.

Nor can any individual capitalist or employer, no matter how charitably inclined he may be, change anything in these conditions. A business or corporation that should try to run its plant on a charity basis would not last long.

No less interesting was his comment relative to the cause of panics. He had asserted that the strength of the capitalist side is so great, and the capacity for resistance on the side of the workman is so insignificant, that there is actually no freedom of contract; that the monopoly of tools had made the employers a class of autocrats and the laborers a class of dependents—of hirelings; simply a hired appendage to the machine. Then he touched upon the cause of the recurrence of panics:

Since the working people do not receive the full value of their products—because a considerable profit is made by the employing class on everything the workers produce—can they be expected to buy back these products? Their numerical strength makes them the chief consumers of the country and those on whom production mainly depends.

In this way, by the laboring people not being able to consume enough, and by the planless way in which production is carried on in general, the so-called overproduction is created.

Of course, no matter how much or how little the toilers of a nation create, they always create more than they are able to buy with their wages, because they have never received the full value of that production.

In this way the so-called industrial crises originate. They have come upon us about once in every twenty years, roughly speaking, since capitalist production began its sway. At such times the trade and the manufacturing of a nation come to a standstill, because "there is too much on hand."

And the working people have to stop work and go ragged and hungry because there is too much on hand.

Statesmen, newspapers, lawyers and so-called reformers on such occasions claim that it is either too much silver or too little silver, or lack of confidence, or what not, that is the cause of the industrial crisis, or panic, as it is sometimes called.

But hard times are really hard only on those whose subsistence depends on their having work to do.

For the poor people the times are always hard.

During "hard times" the wives and daughters of the capitalists, however, do not leave off attending balls, parties and operas, in their silks and diamonds.

On the contrary, if the times are very hard, the wealthy and charitable people simply arrange one more amusement and call it a "charity ball."

As far as security of work is concerned, the workman of the present time is worse off than any of his predecessors in history. In fact, the irregularity of his employment, the frequency with which he is out of work, is the most alarming feature of the workingman's condition. The toiler of to-day cannot work when he wants to, or when he ought to, in order to support himself and family. He can work only when it is to the profit of the employer that he should do so.

In response to questions asked he expressed the opinion that the era of the trusts is but a milestone in industrial evolution, and that it would be an easy step from government control, as advocated by Judge Gary of the Steel Trust, to Socialism. He believed complete ownership the final solution to the great problem presented by modern industrial conditions.

His fellow-members of Congress did not regard him as a bugbear, but as a man of ideas, one looking at the great problem from a different angle, and like themselves searching for the truth that might effect the betterment of the condition of all. They did not regard this man as either an enemy to religion or society because his viewpoint was different from their own.

The death rate in Birmingham, England, which in 1851 was 26 per thousand, was reduced to 12½ per thousand in 1910. A very large factor in this result, it is claimed, was the introduction of sanitary plumbing. Typhoid fever has practically disappeared from the city, and deaths from other diseases due to bad drainage have been greatly reduced also.

Buenos Aires, the largest city in the Southern Hemisphere, is enjoying a boom in real estate, a plot of ground 27 by 35 feet being recently sold for $424,000 or some $647 per square foot. The population of the city is now 1,326,994.

The municipal gas industry of Bradford, England, produced a profit last year of about $65,000 from the sale of gas, the rate being 50 cents per thousand cubic feet.

Why Does Minority Fill All The Stage?

From *Hampton's Magazine*

THE coronation of George the Fifth having passed from the arena of current events, post facto meditation suggests a query whether the space it occupied was not disproportionate and slightly irrational. On reflection, the crowning of a king hardly seems an event over which a sophisticated people would care to become very ecstatic, and since the thing went off according to the set program and was neither a very difficult feat nor very significant, the amount of literature it called forth is truly calculated to awaken wonder.

Not to speak disparagingly of an ancient institution, one is obliged to confess that very curious hallucinations seemed to pertain to this subject. One, naïvely entertained by our British friends, was that the whole world shared their own breathless excitement about a phase of surviving feudalism. As a matter of fact, the masses of mankind knew nothing about it and would have cared as little if they had known. The event celebrated with so much éclat in London was significant to only an infinitesimal fraction of the race.

This fact is weakened in no way by piling up the great figures of the populations that the King of England is supposed to rule. They have nothing to do with him, nor he with them. Their concern in life is to get something to eat, and whether they have one king or a million affects in no way that inevitable and incessant pursuit.

The rather strange truth is that the coronation was an affair of a mere handful and interested only a trifling percentage of people anywhere. By some delusion not to be analyzed, certain American editors were induced to believe that their readers eagerly lapped up every detail of the performance and read with avidity of him that bore the king's posset and him that polished the royal shoes. As a matter of fact, again, observation showed that the average reader never got beyond the headlines describing these marvels. For about ninety-nine per cent. of the average newspaper constituency the rest of the space was utterly wasted.

Not even the wondrous fact that John Hays Hammond, the American Representative, appeared in the procession wearing knee pants, silk stockings and slippers, met the wandering eye of the bored public.

It is these singular perversions and distortions of the true perspective that must chiefly interest the philosophical observer. For instance, take Mr. Hammond in his knee pants. Obviously he was no more the representative of the American people than he was of Mars. If he had represented the American people he would have worn overalls and a jumper. That seems funny or incongruous to you? It is neither. The vast majority of the American people work with their hands for their daily bread. In what conceivable way could they be represented by a dainty gentleman in satin trunks and slippers?

As a matter of fact, once more. Mr. Hammond in his comic opera dress represented only the extremely minute fragment of this nation that still draws its inspiration from the dark ages, and has no more relation to the actualities of the nation's life than it has to the pyramids. Yet this proportion is exactly the same as the proportion of people in the British Empire to whom the coronation was important, and the proportion in this country to whom it was interesting.

In view of the noise made everywhere by this minority, and in view, further, of the fact that the expenses of Mr. Hammond and his flunkeys were paid by the people that he did not represent, the thing on calm revision looks somewhat askew. At least it might well be the subject of further meditation by anyone that cares to know of conditions as they really are in this world.

—

Note by G. W.: Hampton's might have noted that Hammond is Guggenheim's hired man and it was for Guggenheim that Taft gave the secret executive order opening up Controller Bay.

Book Review

GRACCHUS BABEUF.

"The Last Episode of the French Revolution; Being the History of Gracchus Babeuf." By Ernest Belfort Bax. (Grant Richards.) 6s. net.

In this work our friend Bax, says London *Justice,* has rendered a service to the revolutionary movement by rescuing from obscurity the memory of one of the most remarkable men of a world-shaking epoch. Mirabeau, Robespierre, Danton, Hébert, St. Just, Marat, all have their place in the history of that remarkable time; but Gracchus Babeuf has, together with the movement identified with his name been lost sight of and forgotten.

This is not strange when the circumstances of the time, and the rapidity with which the varied events of the revolutionary epoch followed each other, are taken into account. In no period that we can recall were so many vast and far-reaching changes—so much history, as it were—crowded together in so brief a space.

The Babouvist movement is described by our author as "the last episode of the French Revolution"; and that closed with the trial and execution of Babeuf in May, 1797—less than eight years after the fall of the Bastille! From the Revolution of 1789 to the final and crushing defeat of the Empire at Waterloo was a period of of only twenty-six years. Yet what a tremendous change had taken place in those twenty-six years! What a different Europe was that of 1815 from that of the ancient régime! Looking back over that time, and comparing it with any similar duration of time in our own days, it seems almost inconceivable that so much could have happened in so few years. Waterloo seems quite modern and much nearer to the present day than the France of the pre-Revolution days of Louis XVI. and Marie Antoinette appears to the France of the Restoration. It is over forty years ago that the Third Empire went down in the débâcle of Sedan. How little apparent change has taken place in those forty years compared with those effected in the twenty-six years between the fall of the Bastille and the fall of the First Empire! The old order had indeed passed away. The ancien régime, feudalism, the divine right of kings, had been swept away in the revolutionary torrent. The Monarchy, the Gironde, the Mountain, had each in turn held sway; and each in turn disappeared as the Revolution, having crushed the old noblesse in the "Terror," proceeded to devour its own children, and Danton, Robespierre, St. Just, and many another Red Republican passed under the impartial knife of the guillotine. Then came the Directory, with Babeuf's conspiracy against its reactionary, anti-revolutionary régime. And all that in eight years; in less time than that which has elapsed since the Boer War, an event which to us appears but as yesterday.

And, in the following sixteen years, the coup d'état of the 18th of Brumaire; the rising and setting of the "sun of Austerlitz"; the practical conquest of Europe by Napoleon; and then Moscow and Elba; the Hundrd Days and Waterloo.

Little wonder that in this swirling suc-

cession of great events, this torrential rush of history, the Babeuf movement, which at one time threatened to overthrow the existing Government of France, should have sunk into oblivion. There is still less reason to wonder, in view of the fact that Babeuf's movement was, as our author says, "a failure, and like all failures, like all movements that are suppressed with real success, or that, to speak in expressive slang, 'peter out,' leaving but slight direct traces behind them, it has tended with the lapse of years to pass into historical oblivion. Comparatively few men of average education in the present day have ever heard of Babeuf. For the great world . . . he left nothing behind him, scarcely even a memory, except for the few interested in the byways and cul-de-sacs of history, and who honor single-handed devotion to the popular cause even when it has been without result."

There is nothing succeeds like success; and the world only worships success and contemns failure, as the world sees success and failure. But who shall say what is really success and what failure? How often is success nothing but failure and the defeat of the object aimed at. How often, again, has seeming failure been the beginning and foundation of the most lasting success.

"Never yet
Share of Truth was vainly set
In the world's wide fallow.
After hands may sow the seed;
After hands, with greater meed,
Reap the harvest yellow."

Who shall say, then, that even Babeuf failed, or that Babouvism was a failure? The movement to which he gave his name was one for reaffirmation of those eternal principles which inspired the first Revolution, and which have been the vital force in every real revolutionary movement—the principles of Justice, of Human Freedom, and of Social Equality. In his organization of the "Equals," Babeuf strove by the restitution of the Constitution of 1793 to give expression to those principles in the Government of France. He failed, and he paid for his failure with his life. But there is hope for humanity while there are men to be found to risk failure and death for those principles as he did. They are those of whom the world is not worthy. It is well, however, that their names and deeds should be rescued from oblivion for remembrance in that happier time when the cause for which they endured the bitterness of defeat shall have triumphed, and men shall be better able to appraise their failure or success. Our gratitude is due to our comrade Bax for the service he has thus rendered alike to the memory of Babeuf and to the revolutionary movement, and for the interesting contribution he has made to the records of an engrossingly interesting period.

For sale by Wilshire Book Co. $1.50, net.

THE NEW REVIEW

A Socialist Weekly

THE undersigned members of the Socialist Party have, after mature deliberation, decided to form an association for the purpose of publishing a weekly review to be named "The New Review."

The primary purpose of the New Review will be the dissemination of a knowledge of the theories, principles and methods of Marxism; and the discussion and analysis of current events, and of the practical problems with which the Socialist movement is confronted, in the light of these theories, principles and methods.

The establishment of a review for this purpose requires no apology. Excepting the United States, there is hardly a single country that does not maintain at least one Socialist review devoted to the serious discussion of the theoretical and practical problems of the labor movement. Such reviews are designed primarily for the education of the Socialists themselves, although they are also read by non-Socialists who desire to obtain a clear understanding of the Socialist movement. In foreign countries, moreover, the leading Socialist dailies are mighty factors of popular education. In the United States, on the other hand, the existing Socialist press concerns itself almost exclusively with the task of winning over the unconverted, while the work of educating those who have been converted is almost entirely neglected. Now and then there may appear in one or another of the existing Socialist publications a serious contribution to Socialist thought; but these rare exceptions, scattered as they are in the great mass of printed matter designed for so-called popular agitation, remain without effect. Indeed, they are frequently not even noticed.

The New Review, on the contrary, will strive to keep abreast of current Socialist thought, and to acquaint its readers with the great and ever-growing international literature of scientific Socialism. It will aim to impart sound information concerning the experiences of the international Socialist movement, in the past as well as in the present. And it will apply the results of the accumulated thought and experience of the international movement to the study of economics, politics and legislation, as well as of the more spiritual forms of social life as expressed in religion, philosophy, science, art and literature.

The New Review will concern itself with the problems, theoretical and practical, of the Socialist movement the world over. But while the modern Socialist movement is essentially the same in all countries dominated by modern capitalism, there are nevertheless special problems peculiar to each country. In the United States, for example, we are called upon to grapple with such problems as the political supremacy of the judiciary, the conflict between state rights and national authority, the total absence of a system of national labor legislation, the oppression of a negro race, and immigration. These and several other questions are peculiar to this country, being the special products of its peculiar political and economic evolution. The New Review will, therefore, concern itself largely with these questions. As an organ of the Socialist movement of this country, The New Review will devote its attention chiefly to the complex, multiform and fierce struggle of the classes in the United States.

It has been estimated that The New Review cannot be started, with any prospect of success, with a sum less than $10,000. To obtain this amount and to meet the requirements of the situation, we have deemed it expedient to form a publishing association with a capital stock of $15,000, divided into fifty shares of common stock at $100 each, and 1,000 shares of preferred stock at $10 each. Over $2,000 worth of capital stock has already been subscribed for. We appeal to all those, who are in sympathy with this undertaking to subscribe for the shares according to their ability, in a spirit of comradeship, and with the confidence employed for the advancement of our great cause.

Each number of The New Review will contain 16 pages, besides special supplements. The subscription price will be $2.00 a year. If you are interested in the purpose of the new publication, and are not at present ready to subscribe to a share of stock, you can aid in the undertaking by sending in your name and address and the names and addresses of your friends. In our next announcement we will inform you of the date of publication.

Richard P. Appleton,
Anna P. Boudin,
Louis B. Boudin,
Dr. A. Caspe,
W. R. Cassile,
Thomas Crimmins,
William Dietrich,
Alexander Fraser,
Bertha Fraser,
Henry Harris,
Dr. L. Herrmann,
Bertha W. Howe,
William Kuhnert,
Joseph Michael,
Dr. M. Michailovsky,
Mary S. Oppenheimer,
Moses Oppenheimer,
Herman Simpson,
Henry L. Slobodin,
J. G. Phelps Stokes,
Andre Tridon,
Louis Wetmore.

For further information communicate with Joseph Michael, corresponding secretary, 123 William Street, New York City.

Lowest Prices Ever Made

We Are Offering at Reduced Prices for the Season the Famous Specialties, for Which the WILSHIRE BOOK COMPANY is Noted:

KARL MARX PINS. These beautiful and artistic emblems are an exact reproduction of the pin worn by Marx and presented by him to his friend Frederick Engels. The design is the red flag, beautifully enamelled. For years it has been a favorite with American Socialists.

Every one who sees one of these handsome pins wants one, but many as yet do not know how to obtain them. We offer the following special inducement to make these pins known to your friends and comrades:

To any one sending an order for five, we shall not only make the rate of five for one dollar, but will present the sender with an extra pin, free of charge. You can easily induce your friends to make up a club of five.

SOCIALIST PILLOW TOPS. Two Mottoes—"Socialism, The Hope of the World," and "Let the Nation Own the Trusts." Beautiful designs stamped in colors. Fascinating embroidery work for women comrades. An attractive item for Socialist fairs, etc. Size 20x22 inches. Reduced to 25 cents each.

Now that the MacNamara case recalls the famous Moyer-Haywood trial of five years ago, it has caused a brisk demand for Friedman's exposure published by us at the time—**THE PINKERTON LABOR SPY.** Copies of this famous work, beautifully and substantially bound in cloth, 50 cents each.

We have yet on hand a few hundred copies of the late Comrade Hanford's splendid propaganda work, **"FIGHT FOR YOUR LIFE."** Strongly bound in paper covers, with portrait of Hanford. Single copies, 15 cents; ten copies, one dollar. A most appropriate volume at this time when Labor is literally forced to "Fight for Its Life."

Read This Offer

Splendid selection of Socialist Pamphlets by the ablest writers of the movement. Unsurpassed for Propaganda purposes. Offered at less than cost price.

In assorted packages of 100 each the following are offered for 50 cents per 100. Assorted packages of 1,000 for $3.50.

MARKETS AND MISERY. By Upton Sinclair.
SOCIALISM, A RELIGION. By Gaylord Wilshire.
DO YOU WANT A $5,000 JOB? By Eugene Wood.
AMERICAN PANICS. By H. H. Caldwell.
THE TRAMP. By Jack London.
EASY LESSONS IN SOCIALISM. By W. H. Leffingwell.
THAT BLESSED WORD, "REGULATION." By Chas. Ed. Russell.
IF CHRIST SHOULD COME. By Mary E. Babbitt.
WILSHIRE-CARVER DEBATE ON SOCIALISM.
SOCIALISM, THE HOPE OF THE WORLD. By Eugene Wood.

This price applies to assorted packages only. If one of the above list is required in large quantity write for prices. We will pay carriage on this offer of assorted pamphlets.

WILSHIRE BOOK COMPANY

113 EAST 26th STREET, NEW YORK

"THE CLEARING-HOUSE FOR ALL SOCIALIST LITERATURE"